

REMARKS

This application is a broadening reissue application that was filed within two years of the issue date of U.S. Patent No. 6,264,659. In the Office Action mailed on April 27, 2009 claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being based upon a defective reissue Oath. The Office Action further indicated that an appropriate supplemental declaration would overcome this rejection. Through this response, Applicants have provided an executed supplemental declaration as required by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of the present application.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in this application is respectfully requested. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. In the event that there are any questions concerning this Response or the application in general, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,
ANTHONY C. ROSS, et al.

By: /Jay B.Bell/
Jay B. Bell, Esq.
Registration No. 58,551
Tel: (858) 909-1853

For: Jonathan Spangler, Esq.
Registration No. 40,182
Tel.: (858) 243-0029

7475 Lusk Boulevard
San Diego, CA 92121

July 27, 2009